ED 028 038

By-Vick, Marian Lee; Johnson, Joseph Carlton II

A Study of the R-lationships Between Primary Grade Pupils Labeled As Either Culruarily Disadvantaged or Culturally Advan. ged and Their Development of Certain Language Skills.

Pub Date 8 Feb 69

Note-16p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, Los Angeles, Feb. 5-8, 1969.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.90

Descriptors-Articulation (Speech), Auditory Discrimination, \*Culturally Advantaged, \*Culturally Disadvantaged, \*Disadvantaged Youth, \*Language Ability, \*Language Skills, Primary Grades, Reading Ability, Socioeconomic

Status, Verbal Ability, Vocabulary Development, Vocabulary Skills

A study was made of the interrelationships among the language skill complex (auditory discrimination, articulation of speech sounds, recognition vocabulary, and vocabulary of use), grade level, intelligence level, race, sex, father's occupation, school, chronological age, and general reading ability of children placed in the primary grades with respect to their cultural index. Three hundred and twenty-two primary-grade children from two elementary schools in Durham County, North Carolina, served as subjects. One school enrolled a predominantly disadvantaged population: the other school enrolled a predominantly advantaged population. Test data were analyzed through variance and covariance techniques of multiple linear regression. Significant differences in auditory discrimination and its relationship to the cultural index could not be attributed to differences in race, sex, father's occupation, school, chronological age, or general reading ability. Articulation of speech sounds was dependent upon grade and the combined factors of grade and chronological age. Recognition vocabulary was dependent upon grade, grade and age combined, intelligence, and general reading ability. Grade, sex, grade and chronological age combined, general reading ability, and intelligence were significant factors for the development and utilization of vocabulary of use. References are included. (Author/CM)



8

9

### U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT MECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PRIMARY GRADE
PUPILS LAFELED AS EITHER CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED
OR CULTURALLY ADVANTAGED AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT
OF CERTAIN LANGUAGE SKILLS 1

by

Marian Lee Vick - Associate Professor of Reading
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical
State University
Greensboro, North Carolina

and

Joseph Carlton Johnson II - Assistant Professor of Reading Education

Duke University

Durham, North Carolina

\* 1This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, February 8, 1969.

#### INTRODUCTION

When one views the various projects presently in operation for disadvantaged children, he soon finds that there is a singular lack of identifiable characteristics of them.

Selection of children for these programs is generally based on the broad subjective criteria of living in a depressed geographic location, being a member of a minority ethnic division, possessing a low socio-economic status, showing verbal deficiencies, and experiencing a lack of academic success in the school situation. Yet, one often finds reports indicating that characteristics of these children range from the very slow and dull to the intellectually gifted and creative. Selection on this basis alone seems inadequate for an effective educational program.

One of the common goals in good educational planning and teaching of children is to identify their specific strengths and weaknesses and then to plan and teach according to their needs. The commonality of this goal is also applicable to the teaching of the disadvantaged.

The purpose of this investigation was to study the interrelationships among the language skill complex (auditory discrimination, articulation of speech sounds, recognition vocabulary, and vocabulary of use), grade level, intelligence level, race, sex, father's occupation, school, chronological age, and general reading ability of children placed in the primary grades with respect to their cultural index. Specifically, the procedures for this study included the following:

- 1. After the most common language skills at the primary grade level had been determined by a survey of the literature, typical tests which purported to measure language skills at the primary grade level were selected, administered, and interpreted. The test data were collected and subjected to analysis. Computerized analysis was accomplished through the variance and covariance techniques of multiple linear regression.
- 2. Three hundred and twenty-two primary-grade children from two elementary schools in Durham County, North Carolina were utilized as the population sample for this study. One school was classified as having enrolled a predominantly disadvantaged population, while the other was categorized as having enrolled a predominantly advantaged population.

# DEFINITION OF TERMS AND CONSTRUCTS

Language skill complex was defined as those skills which refer to the verbal mediators one uses in communicating to others the results of his thought processes, that are regarded as "standard" English and prerequisities for academic success in the schools. As such, the construct includes auditory discrimination, articulation of speech sounds, recognition vocabulary, and vocabulary of use.

Auditory discrimination was defined as the "recognizing and distinguishing between the sounds represented by different letters and groups of letters."

Articulation was defined as the ability of children to produce standard English sounds correctly in words. The standard English sounds consist of consonant sounds in the initial, medial, and final positions; double-consonant blends; triple-consonant blends; vowels and diphthongs.

<u>Vocabulary of recognition</u> was defined as those words that are recognized or understood when heard or read.

Vocabulary of use was defined as those words that are actually produced or used in oral and written speech.

<u>Cultural index</u> was defined as the subjective identification of children by their teachers as either culturally disadvantaged or advantaged.

Culturally disadvantaged was defined as those primary grade-level children who were subjectively labeled as such by teachers.

<u>Culturally advantaged</u> was defined as those primary gradelevel children who were subjectively labeled as such by their teachers.



#### TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES

1. The population sample for this investigation was selected from the student bodies of two schools (an elementary and a union) of the Durham County, North Carolina public school system. Three hundred and twenty-two children, almost equally divided as to sex, were examined for the study, These children were drawn from all of the first-, second-, and third-grade classrooms in the two schools.

Final selection of children was based on an obtained range of abilities in reading achievement, the development and utilization of the language skill complex, and intelligence.

That is, since the primary focus of this study was on the interrelationships among the language skill complex, grade level, intelligence level, race, sex, father's occupation, school, chronological age, and general reading ability of children placed in the primary grades with respect to their cultural index, the above information was obtained in order to assure that the children studied represented the entire reading achievement, intellectual level, and linguistic range.

The main criterion utilized was the language skill complex (auditory discrimination, articulation of speech sounds, recognition vocabulary, and vocabulary of use). Test were selected at each grade level for each facet of the language



skill complex. Consequently, each child was administered a total of six tests.

2. Specifically, children in the two schools were initially given the <u>Institute for Personality and Ability Testing (IPAT) Culture Fair (or Free) Intelligence Test</u>, Scale 1 for ages 4 - 8, and the <u>Culture Fair Intelligence</u>

Test, Scale 2, ages 8 - 13 Forms A and B, to all third-grade children who were nine years old; the <u>Gatea-MacGinitia Reading Tests</u>, Form 1 - Primary A Grade one; Primary B Grade two; and Primary C Grade three; <u>Wepman's Auditory Discrimination</u>

Test, Form 1; the <u>Templin-Darley Test of Articulation</u>; and the <u>Seashore-Eckerson English Recognition Vocabulary Test</u>, for First, Second, and Third Grades, as modified by M. K. Smith. Four open-ended questions were utilized to secure a sample of verbal responses.

The sample studied may be regarded as a representative sample of primary grade populations. Children in the sample fell across the entire range of intelligence levels, ages, grade levels, race, sex, reading achievement levels, socioeconomic levels, and the cultural index. Generalizations to these populations then seem appropriate. A listing of the means and standard deviations of the total population on all variables is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Listing of the Means and Standard Deviations of the Total Population on all Variables

		Variables	Mean	as
Crade   II	-	Grade I	.37	87*
Crade III	•		. œ	97
Female	•		. 25	. 43
Female Caucasian School A School A School B Socio-economic status Culture fair I SwA-PMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ Reading (vocabulary) Reading (vocabulary) Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) Articulation of speech sounds Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) Recognition	7		67.	.50
Caucasian  Negroid School A School B Socio-economic status Culture fair IQ Sulture fair IQ Sul	•		.51	.50
Negroid School A School B School B Scoio-economic status Socio-economic status Culture fair IQ SRA-FMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ SRA-FMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ Reading (vocabulary) Reading (comprehension) Average reading Av	Ģ	Caucasian	.65	. 48
School A School B School B Scoto-economic status School B Socio-economic status Chronological age Culture fair IQ SRA-PMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ SRA-PMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ Reading (vocabulary) Reading (comprehension) Average reading	7	Negrotd	.35	.47
School B Socio-economic status Socio-economic status Socio-economic status Chronological age Culture fair IQ SRA-FMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ SRA-FMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ Reading (vocabulary) Reading (comprehension) Reading (comprehension) Staticular or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ SRA-FMAT o	<b>.</b>		.34	.47
Socio-economic status  Chronological age Culture fair IQ SRA-PMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ SRA-PMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ Reading (vocabulary) Reading (comprehension) Recognition vocabulary (corrected score) Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) Recognition vocabulary of use Culturally disadvantaged Culturally advantaged Culturally advantaged Culturally disadvantaged	6	School B	_	•
Chronological age Culture fair IQ SRA-PMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ SRAdding (vocabulary) SRadding (comprehension) SAVETAGE reading Average reading Average reading Average reading Average reading SAVETAGE TO	10.	Socio-economic status	4	7
Culture fair IQ  SRA-FMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ  Reading (vocabulary)  Reading (comprehension)  Reading (comprehension)  Average reading  Ave	11.	Chronological age	5.2	
SRA-FMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ 103.28  Reading (vocabulary) Reading (comprehension)  Reading (comprehension)  Reading (comprehension)  Average reading  Average reading  Average reading  Auditory discrimination (X score)  Auditory discrimination (Y score)  Auditory discrimination (Y score)  Ruditory discrimination (Y score)  Articulation of speech sounds  Recognition vocabulary (corrected score) 13.09  Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) 40.77  Vocabulary of use  Culturally disadvantaged  Culturally advantaged  Culturally advantaged  Culturally advantaged  Culturally advantaged  Culturally advantaged	12.	Culture fair 10	4.4	•
Reading (vocabulary)  Reading (comprehension)  Reading (comprehension)  Average reading  Auditory discrimination (X score)  Auditory discrimination (Y score)  Articulation of speech sounds  Recognition vocabulary (corrected score)  Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score)  Recognitio	13.	lman-Anderson	3.2	_
Reading (comprehension)  Average reading Average reading Auditory discrimination (X score) Auditory discrimination (Y score) Articulation of speech sounds Articulation of speech sounds Recognition vocabulary (corrected score) Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) Recognition vo	14.		8	1.59
Average reading Auditory discrimination (X score) Auditory discrimination (Y score) Articulation of speech sounds Articulation vocabulary (corrected score) Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) Vocabulary of use Culturally disadvantaged Culturally advantaged	15.		0	• -
Auditory discrimination (Y score)  Auditory discrimination (Y score)  Articulation of speech sounds  Recognition vocabulary (corrected score)  Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) 40.77  Vocabulary of use  Culturally disadvantaged  Culturally advantaged  .67  .67	16.	•	8	
Articulation of speech sounds Articulation of speech sounds Recognition vocabulary (corrected score) 13.09 Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) 40.77 Vocabulary of use Culturally disadvantaged Culturally advantaged Culturally advantaged	17.	discrimination	21.12	
Articulation of speech sounds  Recognition vocabulary (corrected score) 13.09 Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) 40.77 Vocabulary of use Culturally disadvantaged Culturally advantaged Culturally advantaged Culturally advantaged Culturally advantaged	18.	discrimination	8	9
Recognition vocabulary (corrected score) 13.09 Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) 40.77 Vocabulary of use Culturally disadvantaged Culturally advantaged 1.00	19.	somuqs	4	•
Recognition vocabulary (uncorrected score) 40.77  Vocabulary of use  Culturally disadvantaged  Culturally advantaged  .67	20.	(corrected	-	8.52
Vocabulary of use Culturally disadvantaged Culturally advantaged	21.			13.92
Culturally disadvantaged Culturally advantaged	22.	U	28.47	10.27
Culturally advantaged	23.	Culturally disadvantaged	.33	.47
That seed the	24.	Culturally advantaged	.67	74.
_	25.		1.00	00.

## DESIGN, ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was designed so that the analysis of the data could be accomplished through the variance and covariance techniques of multiple linear regression as described by Bottenberg and Ward.

Such an analysis utilizes criterion and preditor variables in Full and Restricted Regression Models. The criterion variables were the individual scores on the language skill complex test. Each criterion gave a Full Regression Model.

The predictor variables included grade, sex, race, age, school, socio-economic status, intelligence scores, general reading ability (vocabulary and comprehension), and the cultural index. These variables are specified as factors in the subordinate hypothesis.

The six Full Regression Models and their necessary characteristics are listed in Table 2 on page 8. This table indicates that for each Full Model fifteen Restricted Models are listed, each of which was generated from a hypothesis to be tested. The first Restricted Model is used to test the subordinate hypothesis about the cultural index, one of the nine secondary variables, and about the combined effect of the cultural index and other predictor variables. This procedure is repeated for each of the nine variables. Thus, there is a primary Restricted Model and nine pairs of sub-



Economic Status, Chronological Age, IQ, Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension. Analyses of the Effects of Criterion Variance of Auditory Discrimination, Articulation of Speech Sounds, Recognition Vocabulary, and Vocabulary of Use on Variables of Cultural Index, Grade, Sex, Race, School, Socio-2 able Ta

ERIC Provided by ERIC

70000 3 1.95261084 4.0729 .83281167 1.8964 .000012400000 .12400000 .12521121 3.1185 3 1.6961 *12321912 5 3.0274 *0914 2.8448 2 10.7620 *12390191 2004612390191 2004612312273 9 7.9530 *1159 1.0952 1 2.004612312273 9 7.9538 *11390191 9 7.9538 *11390694	Variables	1000	AD		1000	ASS		<del></del>
variables except grade divisions         .1357         .0000         .1231         .2196           variables except grade divisions         .1283         .9926         .11084         4.0729           variables except race         .1357         .0000         .1127         .18964           variables except race         .1357         .0000         .1270         .0000           variables except chronological age except culture fair IQ         .1015         3.0274         *         .0914         2.8448           variables except culture fair and SRA-PMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ         .0952         10.7620         *         .1239         .0191           variables except reading vocabulary         .0759         7.9530         *         .1129         .0952           variables except reading vocabulary         .0759         7.9530         *         .1129         .1239         .0191           variables except reading vocabulary         .1269         2.3358         .1227         .3589           d reading comprehension         variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT         .1256         .13335         .1227         .3589           Kuhlman-Anderson, reading vocabulary         .0639         4.7765         *         .1138         .6694		KSON	FAX	XXX	KSCX	ĸ	×××	+
variables except grade divisions         .1283         1.9526         .1084         4.0729           variables except school         .1357         .0000         .1240         .0000           variables except school         .1357         .0000         .1239         .0194           variables except school         .136         .5552         .1123         .1185           variables except chronological age         .129         .16961         * .1239         .0194           variables except culture fair IQ         .0952         10.7620         * .1240         .1649           variables except culture fair and SRA-BAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ         .1333         .6339         .1240         .16649           variables except reading vocabulary variables except reading vocabulary         .1281         2.0046         .1231         .2273           variables except reading vocabulary variables except reading vocabulary         .1269         2.3358         .1227         .3589           variables except culture fair, SRA-FWAT         .1256         1.3335         .1227         .3589           variables except reading vocabulary         .1256         .1335         .1227         .3589           variables except culture fair, SRA-FWAT         .16639         4.7765         * .1138         .16649	Variables except		0000		1.1231	.2196		
variables except sex variables except race variables except race variables except school variables except chronological age variables except chronological age variables except culture fair IQ variables except culture fair IQ variables except culture fair and SRA-PMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ variables except reading vocabulary variables except reading vocabulary variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Kuhlman-Anderson, reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Variables except reading vocabulary  Variables excep	variables except		1.9526	:	Ø	.072	*	
variables except race variables except school variables except school variables except chronological age variables except chronological age variables except culture fair IQ variables except culture fair and SRA- race control of comprehension variables except culture fair and SRA- race control of comprehension variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except culture fair variables except culture	variables except	.1325	.8328		11167	.896		
variables except school variables except socio-economic status variables except chronological age variables except culture fair IQ variables except culture fair IQ variables except culture fair and SRA-MAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT  i reading comprehension variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except culture fair s	variables except	.1357	0000		.1240	000		
variables except chronological age variables except chronological age variables except culture fair IQ variables except culture fair IQ variables except culture fair and SRA-MAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables except reading vocabulary variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT variables	variables except	.1341	7		m	019		
variables except chronological age variables except grade divisions and CA.1015 3.0274 * .0914 2 variables except culture fair IQ variables except culture fair and SRA- variables except culture fair and SRA- variables except reading vocabulary variables except reading vocabulary il reading comprehension variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT  Kuhiman-Anderson, reading vocabulary il reading comprehension variables except culture fair, SRA-MAT	variables except		555		11121	.118	•	
variables except grade divisions and CA .1015 3.0274 * .0914 2 .0952 tulture fair IQ .0952 10.7620 * .1240 1 .1240 1 .1239	variables except	.129	9		1232	191		
variables except culture fair 1Q .0952 10.7620 * .1240 1 .1240 1 .1240 1 .1240 1 .1240 1 .1240 1 .1240 1 .1240 1 .1240 1 .1240 1 .1240 1 .1240 1 .1239 .1231 .1333	variables except	101	.027	*		844	*	
variables except SRA-PMAT or Kuhlman-lerson IQ variables except reading vocabulary variables except reading vocabulary l reading comprehension variables except culture fair, SRA-PWAT l reading comprehension variables except culture fair, SRA-PWAT kuhlman-Anderson, reading vocabulary l reading comprehension variables except culture fair, SRA-PWAT l reading comprehension variables except culture fair succession variabl	variables except	.095	762	*	1 4	799		
variables except culture fair and SRA- Nor Kuhlman-Anderson IQ veriables except reading vocabulary variables except reading vocabulary d reading comprehension variables except reading vocabulary d reading comprehension  Variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT Kuhlman-Anderson, reading vocabulary d reading comprehension  1333 1239 1129 1221 1227 1227 1239 1226 1231 1226 1231 1227 1238 1231 1231 1231 1232 1233 13335 13	variables except				† Į			
variables except culture fair and SRA- AT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ veriables except reading vocabulary variables except reading vocabulary d reading comprehension variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT Kuhlman-Anderson, reading vocabulary d reading comprehension d reading comprehension  .0639 4.7765 ** .1159 1 .1231 .1226 .1227 .1238 .1227 .1238 .1239 .1231 .1236 .1231 .1236 .1231 .1236 .1231 .1236 .1231 .1236 .1231 .1236 .1231 .1236 .1231 .1238	Anderson IQ		633		1239	Œ		
veriables except reading vocabulary variables except reading comprehension variables except reading vocabulary d reading comprehension variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT Kuhlman-Anderson, reading vocabulary d reading comprehension d reading comprehension  .059 7.9530 * .1129 1.1231 1.226 2.3358 .1226 2.1227 3.1227 4.7765 * .1138	All variables except culture fair and SRA-		)		\ !	•		
variables except reading vocabulary.12812.0046.1231variables except reading vocabulary.12692.3358.1226variables except reading vocabulary.12561.3335.1227Variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT.12561.3335.1227Kuhlman-Anderson, reading vocabulary.06394.7765*	PMAT or Kuhlman-Anderson IQ	.0759	.953	*		v		_
variables except reading vocabulary  d reading comprehension  variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT  Kuhlman-Anderson, reading vocabulary  d reading comprehension  Compr		.1281	.004		23	1		
variables except reading vocabulary    reading comprehension	variables except reading	.1269	.335		22	5		
.1256 1.3335 .1227 .0639 4.7765 * .1138	variables except reading					)		
.0639 4.7765 * .1138	and reading comprehension	.125	3		1227	S		
.0639 4.7765 * .1138	All variables except culture fair, SRA-PMAT					)		
.0639 4.7765 * .1138	or Kuhlman-Anderson, reading vocabulary							
	and reading comprehension	.0639	4.7765	*	.1138	7699.		

Equal to the ratio of the criterion variance \*Squared Multiple Correlation Coefficients. accounted for by the prediction system.

t as described by Bottenberg and Ward (1963, ch. 2) and variables indicate significance at the .05 level of confidence. \*\*F Test

\*\*Starre

All variables except cultural All variables except grade di All variables except grade di All variables except sex All variables except school All variables except chronol All variables except chronol All variables except culture All variables except culture RMAT or Kuhlman-Andersin IQ All variables except reading Ruhlman-Anderson, reading variables except culture Kuhlman-Anderson, reading variables except contrure
---

Equal to the ratio of the criterion variance med Multiple Correlation Coefficients. Equal to the ratio of the scounted for by the prediction system. St. 2) at as described by Bottenberg and Ward (1963, ch. 2) red variables indicate significance at the .05 level of confidence.

9

ordinate Restricted Models for a total of nineteen.

The hypotheses, results, and conclusions are as follows.

Primary Null Hypothesis

The development and utilization of the total language skill complex (auditory discrimination, articulation of speech sounds, recognition vocabulary, and vocabulary of use) will not differ significantly between groups of primary grade-level children who have been subjectively labeled by their teachers as either culturally disadvantaged or advantaged. Results indicate that the hypothesis could not be rejected for the development and utilization of the total language skill complex. It was concluded that significant differences in the development and utilization of the total language skill complex could not be traced to differences among primary-grade level children who were subjectively labeled by their teachers as either culturally disadvantaged or advantaged. Subordinate Mull Hypothesis

The subordinate hypothesis dealt with the premise that any relationship between the development and utilization of the language skill complex by primary grade-level children is not dependent on factors of or on the combined effect of:

- a. Grade level
- b. Intelligence level
- c. Race



- d. Sex
- e. Father's occupation 1
- f. School
- g. Chronological age
- h. General reading ability
- Cultural index (subjective identification of children by their teachers as either culturally disadvantaged or advantaged)

The assumption that auditory discrimination is not affected by grade division, chronological age, and intelligence level was rejected at the five per cent confidence level insofar as the total language skill complex of primary grade-level children is concerned. It was concluded that significant differences in auditory discrimination and its relationship, if any, to the cultural index could not be attributed to differences in race, sex, father's occupation, school, chronological age, and general reading ability.

<sup>1</sup> W. L. Warner, II. Meeker, and K. Eells, Social Class in America, (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1960), pp. 140-41. According to these authors the father's occupation is a social index for determining socio-economic status. For this reason the father's occupations were obtained for all of the children used in the study. Each occupation was given a number corresponding to its category as determined on the basis of research conducted by Warner, Meeker, and Eells.

Results indicated that articulation of speech sounds is dependent upon grade, and the combined factors of grade and chronological age. No other variables were significant. Results also indicated that recognition vocabulary is dependent upon grade, the combined factors of grade and age, intelligence level, and general reading ability. It was concluded that differences in the development and utilization of recognition vocabulary between culturally disadvantaged and advantaged children could not be attributed to factors of sex, race, socioeconomic status, cultural index, and school.

Results also indicated that grade, sex, the combined factors of grade and chronological age, general reading ability, and intelligence level are significant factors for the development and utilization of vocabulary of use.

### **IMPLICATIONS**

These data provide implications for reading theory and practice.

1. The study indicates that when a number of variables are controlled, the total language skill complex of primary grade-level children is not appreciably affected by the subjective identification of children by their teachers as either culturally disadvantaged or advantaged. Consequently, the results question whether the subjective labeling of primary grade-level children as either culturally disadvantaged or advantaged should be the major criterion utilized in assessing

the development and utilization of the fundamental language skills for children in this age range as is currently the vogue?

- 2. Do any of the language skills measured in the primary grades function more strongly with respect to language development in the intermediate grades? If any of these skills are found to be related to the total language skill complex above the primary grade level, this finding may be interpreted as evidence that as children become older cultural differences become more prominent.
- 3. It was found that grade division and chronological age are significant factors for auditory discrimination. Does this finding mean that more stress and emphasis should be placed on discriminatory exercises in the classrooms for the grades utilized in this investigation?
- 4. Grade division and chronological age were of use in predicting articulation of speech sounds of primary grade-level children. This finding raises the question of whether less frequently used language skills would be better predictors of articulation of speech sounds?
- 5. It appears that recognition vocabulary is primarily affected by variables of grade, intelligence level, general reading ability, and the combined factors of grade and chronological age. This finding implies that the variables



of general reading ability, grade, intelligence level, and the combined factors of grade and chronological age are significant predictors of recognition vocabulary.

- 6. The sixth implication suggests that grade, sex, the combined factors of grade and chronological age, general reading ability, and intelligence level are significant predictors of vocabulary of use. Does this finding suggest socioeconomic status and school (in addition to variables used in the preceding) are not significant factors as one might assume them to be?
- 7. Because the results of this study were interpreted in terms of the variables and instruments used in the study, the subject of the investigation might also be constructively approached with other combinations of predictor variables and sets of instruments.



#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bloom, Benjamin S., Allison Davis, and Robert Hess. Compensatory Education for Cultural Departments New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
- Bottenberg, Robert A., and Joseph H. Ward, Jr. Applied Multiple Linear Regression. Technical Documentary Report FRL-TDR- 63-6, (March, 1963), 96-109.
- Cheyney, Arnold B. <u>Teaching Culturally Disadventaged in the Elementary School</u>. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merill Books, Inc., 1967.
- Corbin, Richard and Muriel Crosby. "The NCTE Task Force:
  Its Organization, Operation and Major Findings,"

  Language Programs for the Disadvantaged, The Report of
  the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of
  Teachers of English, 1965.
- Education. LXXV (April, 1965), 450-512.
- Frost, Joe L. and Glenn R. Hawkes (Editors). The Disadvantaged Child. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.
- Smith, Nila B. Reading Instruction for Today's Children. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Taba, Hilda and Deborah Elkins. Teaching Strategies for the Culturally Disadvantaged. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.
- The Reading Teacher. XVIII (March, 1965), 465-505.
- Warner, W. L., M. Meeker and K. Eells. Social Class in America. New York; Harper and Row, Publishers, 1960.
- Witty, Paul A. (Editor). The Educationally Retarded and and Disadvantaged. The Sixty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: Distributed by the University of Chicago Press, 1967.